30. (New) The method of claim 10, wherein the network client computers belong to multiple logical broadcast domains.

31. (New) The method of claim 10, further comprising allowing communication between network client computers internally within a switch device by the logical broadcast domains.

32. (New) The method of claim 10, further comprising allowing communication between network client computers externally through the routing computer by the logical broadcast domains.

33. (New) The method of claim 10, further comprising preventing unauthorized communications between customers.--

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, and 25-33 are pending in this application. Claims 2-4, 9, 11-13, 18-21 and 23-24 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 22 has been amended to include substantially the limitations of claim 23-24, which have been cancelled. Claims 25-33 are newly added claims. Support for claims 25 and 29 can be found on page 6, line 17 through page 6, line 24 of the specification. Support for claim 26-28 and 30-32 can be found on page 5, line 25 through page 6, line 20 of the specification. Support for claim 33 can be found on page 5, line 12 through page 5, line 14 of the specification.

In the Office Action dated January 03, 2001, in the parent application serial number 09/039,197, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which application regards as the invention. To the extent this rejection might apply to the claim as now amended, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 1 recites at least one service computer configured to provide multiple network services via the computer network. The computer network further includes a logical connection device coupled between the service computers and the network client computers. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the logical connection device coupled between the service computers and the network client computers particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention.

In the Office Action dated January 03, 2001, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (U.S. Patent 5,835,727) in view of Wesinger, Jr. *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,898,830). To the extent this rejection might apply to the claim as now amended, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 1 recites a computer network that comprises at least one service computer configured to provide multiple network services via the computer network and at least one connection device that allows multiple network client computers to access the network services via the computer network. The computer network further includes a logical connection device coupled between the service computers and the network client computers. The logical connection device is configured to create logical broadcast domains among the network services and the network client computers, wherein each logical broadcast domain comprises a logical grouping of selected network services and selected network client computers. The computer network further includes at least two routing devices each implementing a single static route policy that governs flow of traffic between the network services and the network client computers and prevents unauthorized access to the computer network, wherein each of the routing devices provides independent routing to the network services.

Amended claim 1 recites use of a logical connection device configured to create logical broadcast domains among the network services and the network client computers. The logical broadcast domains allow network client computers on different physical domains to be grouped together. It is important to note that the logical broadcast domains are not limited to a single domain, but rather are multi-domain in nature. In this way, groups of network services can be made available to appropriate groups of network client computers, regardless of the domain of the network client computers. In contrast, Wong *et al.* create a logical grouping of clients through the SMS server and IP addresses of devices on a single network domain. The ability to make available network services across multiple domains of network client computers is a significant and non-obvious expansion of the teaching contained in Wong, et al. In addition, the single routing policy for each routing device disclosed in claim 1 is static in nature. This is different from the dynamic filtering profile and rules followed in each packet to access certain network services implemented in Wong *et al.* In fact, the use of the single static routing policy is counter-intuitive to the approach used in most routing schemes, including the scheme implemented in Wong *et al.* Therefore, because neither Wong, *et al.* nor Wesinger, Jr. *et al.* discloses logical broadcast domains that are multi-domain in nature and use a single static routing policy as recited in claim 1, claim 1 would not be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Because neither prior art reference shows or suggests the claimed features, the combination of the references similarly fails to render obvious the claimed invention.

Claims 5-8, being dependent on claim 1, are likewise patentable in view of the foregoing arguments. Claim 10 is also not obvious because claim 10 recites a method of providing network services using the computer network recited in claim 1. Claims 14-17, being dependent on claim 10, are likewise patentable in view of the foregoing arguments.

The rejected claims have been amended and/or shown to be allowable over the prior art. The Applicants believe that this paper is fully responsive to each and every

ground of rejection or objection cited by the Examiner in the action dated January 3, 2001, in the parent application serial number 09/039,197, to the extent the rejection or objection might apply to the claims as now amended. The Applicants believe that their application is now in condition for allowance.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09469/002002).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/4/01

for *Robt P.W., Reg. 46,479*

Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. 33,986
Rosenthal & Osha L.L.P.
700 Louisiana, Suite 4550
Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: (713) 228-8600
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778

19613_1

Marked-Up Version of Claims

IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (Amended) A computer network comprising:

[one or more] at least one service [computers] computer configured to provide multiple network services via the computer network,

[one or more] at least one logical connection [devices] device that allow multiple network client computers to access the network services via the computer network,

a logical connection device coupled between the service computers and the network client computers and configured to create logical broadcast domains among the network services and the network client computers, wherein each logical broadcast domain comprises a logical grouping of selected network services and selected network client computers, and

[a single] at least two routing [computer] devices [that serves as a firewall through which all] each implementing a single static route policy that governs flow of traffic between the network services and the network client computers [must pass] and prevents unauthorized access to the computer network, wherein each of the routing devices provides independent routing to the network services.

10. (Amended) A method for use in providing network services via a computer network to multiple network client computers, the method comprising:

allowing the network client computers to access the network services via one or more connection devices in the computer network, [and]

creating logical broadcast domains among the network services and the network client computers, wherein each logical broadcast domain comprises a logical grouping of selected network services and selected client computers, and

requiring all traffic within the network services to pass through routing devices that each implement a single static route policy to prevent unauthorized, and

requiring all traffic between the network services and the network client computers to pass through [a single] at least two routing [computer] devices that [acts as a firewall] each implement a single static route policy.

22. (Amended) A method for use in providing a network service to multiple network client computers via a computer network, the method comprising:

requiring all traffic between the computer network and each of the network client computers to pass through [one of two] a routing [computers] device, [that acts as firewalls, and]

creating logical broadcast domains among the network services and the network client computers,

requiring all traffic between the network service and the network client computers to pass through [another] a routing [computer] device, [that acts as a firewall.]

applying a static route policy to govern the flow of traffic between the network services and the network client computers, and

storing the static route policy with a route table in the routing device.